



## ***Texas Department of Insurance***

### ***Division of Workers' Compensation***

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48  
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645  
512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## ***MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION***

### ***GENERAL INFORMATION***

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL DALLAS  
C/O BURTON & HYDE PLLC  
PO BOX 684749  
AUSTIN TX 78768-4749

**Carrier's Austin Representative Box**  
#15

**MFDR Date Received**  
DECEMBER 27, 2005

#### **Respondent Name**

BANKERS STANDARD INS CO

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-06-2852-02

### ***REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Requestor's Position Summary Dated December 27, 2005:** "Carrier did not pay claim per TWCC Stop Loss. Carrier denied request for reconsideration. Hospital is requesting that we be reimbursed at TWCC Stop Loss."

**Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated March 28, 2011:** "1. The Audited charges in this case are \$50,295.35. 2. The services provided by the hospital were unusually costly and extensive...because:

- **Complications.** Post-surgery, [Claimant] became unresponsive and started bleeding through his urinary catheter ...Dr. Valadez's diagnosis was that [Claimant] had a syncopal and hypotensive episode that he attributed to a vasovagal reaction combined with volume depletion and possible spinal stenosis.
- **Multiple surgeries.** As indicated in the hospital records, [Claimant] underwent multiple surgical procedures: Procedure Code 81.08 – Lumbar and lumbosacral fusion of the anterior column; Procedure Code 80.51 – Excision of intervertebral disc; and Procedure Code 57.18 – Other suprapubic cystostomy.
- **Front-loaded costs.** The cost associated with the hospital's services in this case are front loaded-i.e. the injured employee underwent complicated surgical procedures requiring an investment in skilled professionals and advanced facilities and medical equipment.
- **Admission outside of the ordinary when compared to system-wide survey of Texas inpatient admission in 2005.** Unusually extensive services were provided during [Claimant's] hospital stay as indicated by the cost of this admission when compared to system-wide averages in the State of Texas. Data for all inpatient admissions in the Texas workers' compensation system was collected from the Department for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. In 2005, the average bill for an inpatient admission was \$29,863.42. [Claimant's] admission was well outside of the ordinary when comparing the billed amount of \$50,295.35 to the system-wide average.

- **The length of stay was outside of the ordinary.** The admission was outside of the ordinary because [Claimant's] hospital stay was lengthy; he underwent a major surgical procedure and required time to recover as indicated by his stay at the hospital that began on July 20, 2005 and ended on July 23, 2005. When compared to the results of a statistical survey of system-wide data maintained by the Division for hospital inpatient admissions in Texas, [Claimant's] stay was longer than most others and exceeded system norms. The average length of stay for hospital inpatient admissions system-wide in the State of Texas for 2005 was three (3) days. [Claimant's] admission lasted four (4) days. His hospital stay was outside of the ordinary (unusual) because the length of stay, four (4) days in [Claimant's] case, exceeded the system-wide average in Texas."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$45,615.91

### ***RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "This claimant was hospitalized for a lumbar spinal fusion. Specifically, per the operative report, the claimant underwent laminectomy, discectomy, and posterior fusion from L4-S1 with instrumentation and Infuse. The operative report indicated that the claimant 'tolerated these procedures well.' The facility has assigned DRG 497 with which we agree. This is a DRG with a complication or a co-morbidity. In this case, this was triggered by an episode of syncope that the claimant sustained postoperatively. This DRG has an average length of stay of 6.3 days. In fact, this claimant was discharged after 3 days, and the hospitalization was in a private room without need for any intensive care services...In summary, it appears that this admission was appropriately paid at the standard Texas Surgical per diem. The facility is entitled to cost plus reimbursement for implanted devices if they submit appropriate documentation. The claimant required no intensive care services and the hospitalization was half of the usual duration for this DRG. The one complication of hypovolemia was easily managed with fluid and blood replacement. Consequently, there are no identified factors of unusual complexity or extensiveness which would justify stop loss reimbursement under exceptional circumstances."

**Responses Submitted by:** Broadspire, P.O. Box 701809, Dallas, TX 75370-1809

### ***SUMMARY OF FINDINGS***

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
July 20, 2005 through July 23, 2005	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$45,615.91	\$0.00

### ***FINDINGS AND DECISION***

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

#### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 27 *Texas Register* 4047, effective May 16, 2002, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee guideline.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

#### **Explanation of Benefits**

- 45 – Charges exceed your contracted/legislated fee arrangement.
- 5 – The procedure code/bill type is inconsistent with the place of service.
- W1 – Workers Compensation State Fee Schedule Adjustment.
- 885-999 – Review of this code has resulted in an adjusted reimbursement of \$0.00
- 885-999 – Review of this code has resulted in an adjusted reimbursement of \$3,354.00

- 975-640-Nurse review in-patient hospital/facility bill.
- 900 – Based on further review, no additional allowance is warranted.
- 981-Reviewed by Medical Director
- 45 – Workers Compensation State Fee Schedule Adjustment
- W4 – Workers Compensation State Fee Schedule Adjustment

Dispute M4-06-2852 was originally decided on November 29, 2007 and subsequently appealed to a contested case hearing at the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) under case number 454-08-1108.M4. This dispute was then remanded to the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation (TDI-DWC) pursuant to a February 16, 2009 SOAH order of remand. As a result of the remand order, the dispute was re-docketed at medical fee dispute resolution and is hereby reviewed.

U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a "STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS," dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.*, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the claim adjudication process as to the workers' compensation receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 trustee of the debtor's estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Burton & Hyde, PLLC, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer's behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.

### Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

### Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The supplemental information was shared among the parties as appropriate. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore

the audited charges equal \$50,295.35. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.

2. In its original position statement, the requestor asserts that “Carrier did not pay claim per TWCC Stop Loss.” 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that “This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission.” The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion states that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” The requestor’s original position statement failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that may constitute unusually extensive services. In its supplemental position statement, the requestor considered the Courts’ final judgment. In regards to whether the services were unusually extensive, the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually extensive services. The requestor’s supplemental position statement asserts, that “The services rendered to [Claimant] were unusually costly and extensive...because: Complications. Multiple Surgeries.” The requestor’s position that this admission is unusually extensive due to surgical procedures and complications fails to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the requestor failed to demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive in relation to similar spinal surgeries or admissions.

The requestor goes on to state:

The length of stay was outside of the ordinary. The admission was outside of the ordinary because [Claimant’s] hospital stay was lengthy; he underwent a major surgical procedure and required time to recover as indicated by his stay at the hospital that began on July 20, 2005 and ended on July 23, 2005. When compared to the results of a statistical survey of system-wide data maintained by the Division for hospital inpatient admissions in Texas, [Claimant’s] stay was longer than most others and exceeded system norms. The average length of stay for hospital inpatient admissions system-wide in the State of Texas for 2005 was three (3) days. [Claimant’s] admission lasted four (4) days. His hospital stay was outside of the ordinary (unusual) because the length of stay, four (4) days in [Claimant’s] case, exceeded the system-wide average in Texas.

The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion states that “...independent reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases.” A review of the data reports provided by the requestor finds that although length of stay for the services in dispute exceeded the average length of stay when compared to admissions with the same principal diagnosis and procedure code, the requestor did not demonstrate or explain how merely exceeding the average length of stay would: (1) constitute unusually extensive services; (2) categorize this case among the relatively few cases to which the stop-loss method may apply. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C).

3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that “Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker.” The requestor in its supplemental position summary states:

Admission outside of the ordinary when compared to system-wide survey of Texas inpatient admission in 2005. Unusually extensive services were provided during [Claimant’s] hospital stay as indicated by the cost of this admission when compared to system-wide averages in the State of Texas. Data for all inpatient admissions in the Texas workers’ compensation system was collected from the Department for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. In 2005, the average bill for an inpatient admission was \$29,863.42. [Claimant’s] admission was well outside of the ordinary when comparing the billed amount of \$50,295.35 to the system-wide average.

The division notes that the audited charges of \$50,295.35 are discussed above as a separate and distinct factor pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(ii). The requestor asserts that because the amount **billed charges** exceeds the average for the same principal diagnosis and procedure codes, and the costs were front-loaded, the **cost** of the services is therefore “out of the ordinary.” Although the requestor lists and quantifies **billing** data, the requestor fails to list or quantify the **costs** associated with the disputed services. In the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, 22 *Texas Register* 6276, the division concluded that “hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital’s costs of providing services.”

The requestor further states:

The costs were front-loaded. The cost associated with the hospital's services in this case are front loaded-i.e. the injured employee underwent complicated surgical procedures requiring an investment in skilled professionals and advanced facilities and medical equipment.

The requestor does not list or quantify the costs associated with these resources in relation to the disputed services, nor does the requestor provide documentation to support a reasonable comparison between the resources required for the spinal surgery. Therefore, the requestor fails to demonstrate that the resources used in this particular admission are unusually costly when compared to resources used in other types of surgeries.

4. The division concludes that the billed charges for the services do not represent the cost of providing those services. The requestor fails to demonstrate that the hospital's resources used in this particular admission are unusually costly. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
  - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission..." The length of stay was three days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of three days results in an allowable amount of \$3,354.00.
  - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(B) allows that "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate: (iv) Blood (revenue codes 380-399)." A review of the submitted hospital bill finds that the requestor billed \$1,325.44 for revenue code 381-Blood/Pkd Red. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor does not demonstrate or justify that the amount sought for revenue code 381 would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement. Additional payment cannot be recommended.
  - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$531.90/unit for Dextrose. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$3,354.00. The respondent paid \$4,679.44. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

### **Conclusion**

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

## ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 additional reimbursement for the services in dispute.

### Authorized Signature

_____	_____	3/20/2013
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

### ***YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL***

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**